The Subtleties of the Wigner Function Formulation of the Chiral Magnetic Effect

Yan Wu,[1,2] De-fu Hou,[2] and Hai-cang Ren[3,2]

[1] *School of Mathematice and Physics, China Geoscience University(Wuhan), Wuhan 430074, China*
[2] *Institute of Particle Physics and Key Laboratory of Quark and Lepton Physics (MOE), Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079, China*
[3] *Physics department, The Rockefeller University, 1230 York Avenue, New York, New York 10021-6399, USA*

(Dated: February 16, 2016)

We assess the applicability of the Wigner function formulation for the chiral Magnetic Effect and noted some issues regarding the conservation and the consistency of the electric current in the presence of an inhomogeneous and transient axial chemical potential. The problems are rooted in the ultraviolet divergence of the underlying field theory associated with the axial anomaly.

PACS numbers: 74.20.Fg,03.75.Nt,11.10.Wx,12.38.-t

arXiv:1601.06520v3 [hep-ph] 14 Feb 2016

The chiral magnetic effect of electrically charged fermions, proposed in [1–4], remains a subject being actively investigated. Because of the axial anomaly, a nonzero axial charge density controlled by the chemical potential μ_5 in an constant magnetic field $\mathbf{B}$ generates an electric current along the magnetic field, given by

$$\mathbf{J} = \frac{e^2}{2\pi^2}\mu_5\mathbf{B} \tag{1}$$

which is free from higher order corrections because of the non-renormalization theorem of the anomaly. A net axial charge density can be implemented through topological charge fluctuations of QCD in a quark-gluon plasma or through topological surface modes of certain Weyl metals. The experimental indications of CME include the charge separation post off-central heavy ion collisions in RHIC[5] and the enhanced electrical conductivity of a Weyl metal in a magnetic field[7].

The experimental situation is far from ideal in RHIC, where the magnetic field generated via off-central collision is inhomogeneous and transient and the thermal equilibrium, if realized, is local. More theoretical investigations of CME are still required to enrich its phenomenological predictions and solidify its experimental evidences observed so far. The field theoretic method [3, 8–10], holography [11, 12] and kinetic theories [13] are the three main approaches explored in the literature.

The kinetic theory is a powerful tool to describe a system not in a global thermal equilibrium. At its very center lies the Wigner function that links various hydrodynamic quantities of the system to the Green's functions of the underlying quantum field theory. The Wigner function was introduced in RHIC physics in [14] and was applied recently to the QGP with net axial charge density [13]. Among its successes are the reproduction of the chiral magnetic current, chiral vortical current and axial anomalies obtained from the field theoretic approaches at a constant axial chemical potential. The situation with an inhomogeneous and transient axial chemical potential has not been considered yet.

In this letter, we would like to point out a subtlety of the Wigner function being used for CME because of the ultraviolet divergence embedded in the underlying quantum field theory. While the subtlety does not impact on the existing result of [13], where the axial chemical potential is assumed constant, a number of problems show up when the axial chemical potential becomes inhomogeneous and/or transient as we shall see. It appears that the Wigner function in its present form is not applicable to this more complicated situation. Throughout this letter, we shall stay with the Euclidean metric $ds^2 = dx_\mu dx_m u$ with all γ matrices hermitian. In particular, $x_4 = it$ for a real time t.

Following [13], the Wigner function for Dirac fermions at the phase space point (x, p) is a 4×4 matrix with its elements defined by

$$W_{\alpha\beta}(x,p) = \int \frac{d^4y}{(2\pi)^4} e^{-ip\cdot y} < \bar\psi_\beta(x_+)U(x_+,x_-)\psi_\alpha(x_-) >, \tag{2}$$

where the gauge link

$$U(x_+,x_-) = e^{ie\int_{x_-}^{x_+} d\xi_\mu A_\mu(\xi)} \tag{3}$$

with $x_\pm = x \pm \frac{y}{2}$ and A_μ the gauge potential. The symbol $< ... >$ denotes an ensemble average, which is not necessarily in thermal equilibrium. The electric current density can be extracted formally from the matrix $W(x,p)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} J_\mu(x) &= ie\int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\mathrm{tr}W(x,p)\gamma_\mu \\ &= ie\int d^4y\delta^4(y)U(x_+,x_-) < \bar\psi(x_+)\gamma_\mu\psi(x_-) > \\ &= \lim_{y\to 0} J_\mu(x,y) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

with

$$J_\mu(x,y) = ieU(x_+,x_-) < \bar\psi(x_+)\gamma_\mu\psi(x_-) >, \tag{5}$$

and the UV divergence embedded in the operator product at the same point makes the limit ill-defined. Since the UV divergence corresponds to a length scale much shorter than the hydrodynamic scales underlying the kinetic theory, a global thermal equilibrium can be assumed

for the ensemble average $< ... >$ in (2) to explore its consequences and the thermal field theory technique becomes handy then.

To illustrate the problem, we consider a massless Dirac field in an external electromagnetic field A_μ and an axion field $A_{5\mu}$ with the action

$$S = \int dt \int d^3x \mathcal{L}, \tag{6}$$

where the Lagrangian density is given by

$$\mathcal{L} = -\bar{\psi}\gamma_\mu(\partial_\mu - ieA_\mu - i\gamma_5 A_{5\mu})\psi \tag{7}$$

The axial chemical potential μ_5 in (1) corresponds to the temporal component of the axion field, i.e. $A_{5\mu} = (\mathbf{A}_5, -i\mu_5)$. The spatial components are relevant if the axial magnetic effect is related to the topological fluctuation in QCD via $A_{5\mu} = \partial_\mu\theta$.

The most straightforward method to calculate the ensemble average in (2) is the closed time path Green function formation which was proposed in [15, 16] and was systematically developed in [17]. The time integral of the action, (6) consists of two branches, one from $-\infty$ to ∞ and the other from ∞ to $-\infty$ and degrees of freedom are thereby doubled. As a result, all field variables acquire an additional index labeling the time branch where they are defined. Consequently, a fermion propagator becomes

$$\mathcal{S}_{\rm CTP}(x,y) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{S}_{11}(x,y) & \mathcal{S}_{12}(x,y) \\ \mathcal{S}_{21}(x,y) & \mathcal{S}_{22}(x,y) \end{pmatrix} \tag{8}$$

where each block is a 4 by 4 matrix in Dirac space. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{11}(x,y)_{\alpha\beta} &\equiv < T[\psi_\alpha(x)\bar{\psi}_\beta(y)] > \\ \mathcal{S}_{12}(x,y)_{\alpha\beta} &\equiv - < \bar{\psi}_\beta(y)\psi_\alpha(x) > \\ \mathcal{S}_{21}(x,y)_{\alpha\beta} &\equiv < \psi_\alpha(x)\bar{\psi}_\beta(y) > \\ \mathcal{S}_{22}(x,y)_{\alpha\beta} &\equiv < \tilde{T}[\psi_\alpha(x)\bar{\psi}_\beta(y)] > \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where $x = (\mathbf{x}, it)$, T denotes time ordering and $\tilde{T}$ anti-time ordering. It is straightforward to link the LHS of (5) to different components of the CTP propagator, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & J_\mu(x,y) \\ &= \begin{cases} -ie{\rm tr}\mathcal{S}_{11}(x_-,x_+)\gamma_\mu \equiv J^1_\mu(x,y) & y_0 \geq 0 \\ -ie{\rm tr}\mathcal{S}_{22}(x_-,x_+)\gamma_\mu \equiv J^2_\mu(x,y) & y_0 < 0 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

with the trace acting on Dirac indices. The expansion of the propagator $\mathcal{S}_{ab}(x_-,x_+)$ to the linear power of the gauge potential A_μ and the axion field $A_{5\mu}$ reads

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{S}_{ab}(x_-,x_+) \\ &= S_{ab}(x_-,x_+) - \sum_c \int d^4z S_{ac}(x_- - z) \\ & \times\gamma^c_{\rho 5} S_{cb}(z - x_+) A_{5\rho}(z) \\ &+ e\sum_{cd}\int d^4z_1 \int d^4z_2 S_{ad}(x_- - z_2)\gamma^d_{\lambda 5} \\ & \times S_{dc}(z_2 - z_1)\gamma^c_\rho S_{ca}(z_1 - x_+) A_\rho(z_1) A_{5\lambda}(z_2) \\ &+ e\sum_{cd}\int d^4z_1 \int d^4z_2 S_{ac}(x_- - z_2)\gamma^c_\rho \\ & \times S_{cd}(z_2 - z_1)\gamma^d_{\lambda 5} S_{da}(z_1 - x_+) A_\rho(z_2) A_{5\lambda}(z_1) \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

with $\gamma^1_\mu = \gamma_\mu$, $\gamma^2_\mu = -\gamma_\mu$, $\gamma^1_{\mu 5} = \gamma_\mu\gamma_5$ and $\gamma^2_{\mu 5} = -\gamma_\mu\gamma_5$, where $S_{ab}(x-y)$ is the free Dirac propagator. Substituting (11) and the expansion

$$U(x_+,x_-) = 1 + ie\int_{x_-}^{x_+} d\xi_\nu A_\nu(\xi) + O(A^2) \tag{12}$$

into (5) and making appropriate Fourier transformations, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} J^a_\mu(x,y) &= e^2 \int \frac{d^4q_1}{(2\pi)^4} \int \frac{d^4q_2}{(2\pi)^4} e^{i(q_1+q_2)\cdot x} \\ & \times\Lambda^{abc}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2) A^b_\rho(q_1) A^c_{5\lambda}(q_2) \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

with the kernel

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^{abc}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2) &= -y_\rho\delta_{ab}K^{ac}_{\mu\lambda}(q_2) \\ & -i[K^{(1)abc}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2) + K^{(2)abc}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2)] \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} K^{ab}_{\mu\nu}(q) &= e^{-\frac{i}{2}q\cdot y}\int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4} e^{-ip\cdot y}{\rm tr}\gamma^a_\mu S_{ab}(p+q)\gamma^b_{\mu 5} S_{ba}(p) \\ K^{(1)abc}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2) &= e^{-\frac{i}{2}(q_1+q_2)\cdot y}\int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4} e^{-ip\cdot y} \\ & \times{\rm tr}\gamma^a_\mu S_{ac}(p+q_1+q_2)\gamma^c_{\lambda 5} S_{cb}(p+q_1)\gamma^b_\rho S_{ba}(p) \\ K^{(2)abc}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2) &= e^{-\frac{i}{2}(q_1+q_2)\cdot y}\int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4} e^{-ip\cdot y} \\ & \times{\rm tr}\gamma^a_\mu S_{ab}(p+q_1+q_2)\gamma^b_\rho S_{bc}(p+q_2)\gamma^c_{\lambda 5} S_{ca}(p) \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

and the repeated CTP indices in (14) and (15) are not to be summed. The momentum representation of various components of the free CTP fermion propagator at thermal equilibrium suffices to extract the UV behavior

and are given explicitly by

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{11}(p) &= \frac{i}{\not p + i0^+ + \mu\gamma_4} - \pi\frac{\not p + \mu\gamma_4}{E} \\
&\times[f(E-\mu)\delta(\bar{p_0}-E) + f(E+\mu)\delta(\bar{p_0}+E)] \\
S_{12}(p) &= -\pi\frac{\not p + \mu\gamma_4}{E}\{f(E-\mu)\delta(\bar{p_0}-E) \\
&+[f(E+\mu)-1]\delta(\bar{p_0}+E)\} \\
S_{21}(p) &= -\pi\frac{\not p + m + \mu\gamma_4}{E}[f(E-\mu)-1]\delta(\bar{p_0}-E) \\
&+f(E+\mu)\delta(\bar{p_0}+E)\} \\
S_{22}(p) &= \frac{-i}{\not p - i0^+ + \mu\gamma_4} - \pi\frac{\not p + \mu\gamma_4}{E}[f(E-\mu)\delta(\bar{p_0}-E) \\
&+f(E+\mu)\delta(\bar{p_0}+E)] \qquad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

where $p = (\mathbf{p}, ip_0)$, $\bar{p_0} = p_0 + \mu$, $E = |\mathbf{p}|$, $\not p \equiv -i\gamma_\nu p_\nu$ and $f(x) = \frac{1}{e^{\beta x}+1}$ with β the inverse temperature and μ the chemical potential associated to the fermion number.

Now we show two problems coming from the limit in (4):

1. The nonconservation of the electric current

Taking the divergence of (13), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial x_\mu}J^a_\mu(x,y) &= ie^2\int\frac{d^4q_1}{(2\pi)^4}\int\frac{d^4q_2}{(2\pi)^4}e^{i(q_1+q_2)\cdot x}(q_1+q_2)_\mu \\
&\times\Lambda^{abc}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2)A^b_\rho(q_1)A^c_{5\lambda}(q_2), \qquad (17)
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
&(q_1+q_2)_\mu\Lambda^{abc}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2) \\
&= -y_\rho\delta_{ab}(q_1+q_2)_\mu K^{ac}_{\mu\lambda}(q_2) \\
&-i(q_1+q_2)_\mu[K^{(1)abc}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2) + K^{(2)abc}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2)] \qquad (18)
\end{aligned}$$

Using the following identities of the free CTP propagator,

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{11}(p+q)\not q S_{11}(p) &= i[S_{11}(p) - S_{11}(p+q)] \\
S_{21}(p+q)\not q S_{11}(p) &= -iS_{21}(p+q) \\
S_{11}(p+q)\not q S_{12}(p) &= iS_{12}(p) \\
S_{21}(p+q)\not q S_{12}(p) &= 0. \qquad (19)
\end{aligned}$$

and shifting some of the integration momenta, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
&(q_1+q_2)_\mu[K^{(1)111}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2) + K^{(2)111}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2)] \\
&= (e^{-\frac{i}{2}(q_1-q_2)\cdot y} - e^{-\frac{i}{2}(q_1+q_2)\cdot y}) \\
&\times\int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}e^{-ip\cdot y}\mathrm{tr}\gamma_\rho S_{11}(p)\gamma_\lambda\gamma_5 S_{11}(p+q_1) \\
&+ (e^{\frac{i}{2}(q_1-q_2)\cdot y} - e^{-\frac{i}{2}(q_1+q_2)\cdot y}) \\
&\times\int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}e^{-ip\cdot y}\mathrm{tr}\gamma_\lambda\gamma_5 S_{11}(p)\gamma_\rho S_{11}(p+q_2), \qquad (20)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&(q_1+q_2)_\mu[K^{(1)112}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2) + K^{(2)112}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2)] \\
&= (e^{\frac{i}{2}(q_1-q_2)\cdot y} - e^{-\frac{i}{2}(q_1+q_2)\cdot y}) \\
&\times\int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}e^{-ip\cdot y}\mathrm{tr}\gamma_\rho S_{12}(p+q_2)\gamma_\lambda\gamma_5 S_{21}(p), \qquad (21)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&(q_1+q_2)_\mu[K^{(1)121}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2) + K^{(2)121}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2)] \\
&= (e^{-\frac{i}{2}(q_1+q_2)\cdot y} - e^{-\frac{i}{2}(q_1-q_2)\cdot y}) \\
&\times\int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}e^{-ip\cdot y}\mathrm{tr}\gamma_\rho S_{21}(p)\gamma_\lambda\gamma_5 S_{12}(p+q_1) \qquad (22)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$(q_1+q_2)_\mu[K^{(1)122}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2) + K^{(2)122}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2)] = 0 \qquad (23)$$

for $a = 1$ and similar equations for $a = 2$. We notice that only the momentum integrals that diverges linearly in y as $y \to 0$ contribute to the limit (4). Therefore, the terms in $S_{ab}(p)$ proportional to the distribution functions can be ignored. Furthermore, the combination of $S_{12}(p+k_1)$ and $S_{21}(p+k_2)$ contributes a product of delta functions, $\delta(\bar{p}_0 + k_{10} + E_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{k_1}})\delta(\bar{p}_0 + k_{20} - E_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{k_2}})$ which gives rise to $\delta(k_{10} - k_{20} + E_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{k_1}} + E_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{k_2}})$ which imposes an upper limit of the $\mathbf{p}$-integration for a fixed external momenta k_1 and k_2 and renders the integral UV finite. Consequently, the only CTP components that contribute to the limit $y \to 0$ of (17) correspond to $a = b = c = 1$ and $a = b = c = 2$ with the vacuum propagators, i.e. $T = \mu = 0$. We obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
(q_1+q_2)_\mu\Lambda^{111}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2) &= 4(-y_\rho q_{1\mu}\epsilon_{\alpha\mu\beta\lambda}q_{2\beta} - q_2\cdot y\epsilon_{\alpha\rho\beta\lambda} \\
&+q_1\cdot y\epsilon_{\alpha\rho\beta\lambda}q_{2\beta})u_\alpha(y) \qquad (24)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(q_1+q_2)_\mu\Lambda^{222}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2) &= 4(-y_\rho q_{1\mu}\epsilon_{\alpha\mu\beta\lambda}q_{2\beta} - q_2\cdot y\epsilon_{\alpha\rho\beta\lambda} \\
&+q_1\cdot y\epsilon_{\alpha\rho\beta\lambda}q_{2\beta})u^*_\alpha(-y) \qquad (25)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$u_\alpha(y) = \int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\frac{p_\alpha e^{-ip\cdot y}}{(p^2 - i0^+)^2} = -\frac{y_\alpha}{8\pi^2y^2}. \qquad (26)$$

Substituting (26) into (24) and (25), we end up with

$$\begin{aligned}
&(q_1+q_2)_\mu\Lambda^{111}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2) = (q_1+q_2)_\mu\Lambda^{222}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q_1,q_2) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\pi^2}\left(\epsilon_{\mu\beta\lambda\rho} + \frac{y_\lambda y_\alpha}{y^2}\epsilon_{\rho\alpha\mu\beta}\right)q_{1\mu}q_{2\beta}. \qquad (27)
\end{aligned}$$

where the Schouten identity

$$y_\mu\epsilon_{\rho\lambda\alpha\beta} + y_\beta\epsilon_{\mu\rho\lambda\alpha} + y_\alpha\epsilon_{\beta\mu\rho\lambda} + y_\lambda\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu\rho} + y_\rho\epsilon_{\lambda\alpha\beta\mu} = 0 \qquad (28)$$

has been employed. The coordinate representation of (27) reads

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial x_\mu}J_\mu(x,y) \\
&= \frac{i}{8\pi^2}\left[\epsilon_{\mu\rho\beta\lambda}F_{\mu\rho}(x)F_{5\beta\lambda}(x) + 2\epsilon_{\mu\rho\alpha\beta}\frac{y_\lambda y_\alpha}{y^2}F_{\mu\rho}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_\beta}A_{5\lambda}(x)\right] \qquad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

where $F_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\partial A_\nu}{\partial x_\mu} - \frac{\partial A_\mu}{\partial x_\nu}$, $F_{5\mu\nu} = \frac{\partial A_{5\nu}}{\partial x_\mu} - \frac{\partial A_{5\mu}}{\partial x_\nu}$ and the CTP indices have been suppressed. Because of the second term on RHS, the limit $y \to 0$, does not exist in

rigorous sense. If we follow a hand-waving definition of the limit by averaging the direction of y (after continuation to Euclidean space, i.e. $y_0 \to -iy_0$), we find [20]

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_\mu} J_\mu(x) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\mu} J_\mu(x,0) = \frac{3i}{32\pi^2}\epsilon_{\mu\rho\beta\lambda} F_{\mu\rho}(x) F_{5\beta\lambda}(x). \tag{30}$$

It is interesting to note that if the axion potential is a pure gradient, $A_{5\mu} = \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_\mu}$, (31) becomes

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_\mu} J_\mu(x,y) = \frac{i}{4\pi^2}\epsilon_{\mu\rho\alpha\beta}\frac{y_\lambda y_\alpha}{y^2} F_{\mu\rho}(x)\frac{\partial^2\theta}{\partial x_\beta \partial x_\lambda} \tag{31}$$

and the limit (30) following the hand-waving definition vanishes.

2. An inconsistency

The electric current, being a functional derivative of the quantum effective action, should satisfy the consistency condition:

$$\frac{\delta J_\mu(x)}{\delta A_\nu(x')} = \frac{\delta J_\nu(x')}{\delta A_\mu(x)} \tag{32}$$

which is generalized to

$$\frac{\delta J^a_\mu(x)}{\delta A^b_\nu(x')} = \frac{\delta J^b_\nu(x')}{\delta A^a_\mu(x)} \tag{33}$$

in CTP formulation because of the doubling of degrees of freedom. The consistency condition dictates the symmetry property of the current-current correlator as well as the relationship between the retarded and advanced Green's function of linear response. To the linear order in the external gauge potential and axion potential, the consistency condition requires

$$\lim_{y\to 0}\left[\Lambda^{abc}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q',q-q') - \Lambda^{bac}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(-q,q-q')\right] = 0. \tag{34}$$

This is, however, not the case because of the UV divergence. It follows from (14) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Lambda^{abc}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q',q-q') - \Lambda^{bac}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(-q,q-q') \\ = & -\delta_{ab}[y_\rho K^{ac}_{\mu\lambda}(q-q') - y_\mu K^{bc}_{\rho\lambda}] \\ = & -i[K^{(1)abc}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q',q-q') - K^{(2)bac}_{\rho\mu\lambda}(-q,q-q') \\ & + K^{(2)abc}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q',q-q') - K^{(1)bac}_{\rho\mu\lambda}(-q,q-q')] \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Upon shifting the integration momentum of $K^{(2)}$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & K^{(1)abc}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q',q-q') - K^{(2)bac}_{\rho\mu\lambda}(-q,q-q') \\ = & \left(e^{-\frac{i}{2}q\cdot y} - e^{-\frac{i}{2}q'\cdot y}\right)\int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}e^{-ip\cdot y} \\ & \times \mathrm{tr}\gamma^a_\mu S_{ac}(p+q)\gamma^c_{\lambda 5} S_{cb}(p+q')\gamma^b_\rho S_{ba}(p) \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & K^{(2)abc}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q',q-q') - K^{(1)bac}_{\rho\mu\lambda}(-q,q-q') \\ = & \left(e^{\frac{i}{2}q\cdot y} - e^{\frac{i}{2}q'\cdot y}\right)\int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}e^{-ip\cdot y} \\ & \times \mathrm{tr}\gamma^a_\mu S_{ab}(p)\gamma^b_\rho S_{bc}(p-q')\gamma^c_{\lambda 5} S_{ca}(p-q). \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Following the arguments after (23), the components with $a=b=c=1$ and $a=b=c=2$ contribute to a nonzero limit of (35) as $y \to 0$ and the consistency condition is thereby violated. We obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Lambda^{111}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q',q-q') - \Lambda^{111}_{\rho\mu\lambda}(-q,q-q') \\ = & \Lambda^{222}_{\mu\rho\lambda}(q',q-q') - \Lambda^{222}_{\rho\mu\lambda}(-q,q-q') \\ = & 4(y_\alpha\epsilon_{\mu\beta\lambda\rho} + y_\lambda\epsilon_{\rho\alpha\mu\beta})u_\alpha(y)(q-q')_\beta \\ = & -\frac{1}{2\pi^2}\left(\epsilon_{\mu\beta\lambda\rho} + \frac{y_\lambda y_\alpha}{y^2}\epsilon_{\rho\alpha\mu\beta}\right)(q-q')_\beta, \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

which implies that

$$\frac{\delta J_\mu(x,y)}{\delta A_\nu(x')} - \frac{\delta J_\nu(x',y)}{\delta A_\mu(x)} = \frac{i}{4\pi^2}\left(\epsilon_{\mu\rho\beta\lambda} + \epsilon_{\mu\rho\alpha\beta}\frac{y_\lambda y_\alpha}{y^2}\right)\frac{\partial A_{5\lambda}}{\partial x_\beta} \tag{39}$$

in coordinate space. Like the case with the current divergence (31), the limit $y \to 0$ does not exists rigorously. For the limit *defined* in (30), we find that

$$\frac{\delta J_\mu(x)}{\delta A_\nu(x')} - \frac{\delta J_\nu(x')}{\delta A_\mu(x)} = \frac{3i}{16\pi^2}\epsilon_{\mu\rho\beta\lambda}F_{5\beta\lambda}(x). \tag{40}$$

Similar to the current divergence, the first term inside the parentheses on RHS of (39) does not contribute if $A_{5\mu}$ is a pure gradient and the RHS of (40) vanishes then.

This inconsistency is related to the nonconservation of the electric current. As the Wigner function is explicitly gauge invariant. The current extracted from it would be conserved if the current were a functional derivative.

We have also considered a static case with $A_{5\mu} = (0,0,0,-i\mu_5)$ with the axial chemical potential spatially inhomogeneous and with the limit (4) taken along a spatial direction only. The Matsubara formulation can be employed directly and there is no complications with the CTP indices. Starting from the definition

$$\begin{aligned} J^a_i(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = & ie^2\int\frac{d^3\mathbf{q}_1}{(2\pi)^4}\int\frac{d^3\mathbf{q}_2}{(2\pi)^4}e^{i(\mathbf{q}_1+\mathbf{q}_2)\cdot\mathbf{x}} \\ & \times\Lambda_{ij}(\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2)A_j(\mathbf{q}_1)\mu_5(\mathbf{q}_2), \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

The analysis proceeds parallely. In particular, we find that

$$(q_1+q_2)_i\Lambda_{ij}(\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2) = -4(\mathbf{q}_1\times\mathbf{q}_2)_j\mathbf{y}\cdot\mathbf{v} \tag{42}$$

and

$$\Lambda_{ij}(\mathbf{q}',\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{q}') - \Lambda_{ji}(-\mathbf{q},\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{q}') = -\epsilon_{ijk}(q-q')_k\mathbf{y}\cdot\mathbf{v} \tag{43}$$

with

$$v_k = iT\sum_n \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{e^{-i\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{y}}p_k}{[\mathbf{p}^2+\pi^2T^2(2n+1)^2]^2} = -\frac{y_k}{8\pi^2\mathbf{y}^2} \tag{44}$$

as $\mathbf{y}\to 0$. Consequently, we find

$$\nabla\cdot\mathbf{J} = \frac{e^2}{2\pi^2}\nabla\mu_5\cdot\mathbf{B} \tag{45}$$

and

$$\frac{\delta J_i(x)}{\delta A_j(x')} - \frac{\delta J_j(x')}{\delta A_i(x)} = \frac{e^2}{8\pi^2}\delta^3(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}')\epsilon_{ijk}\frac{\partial\mu_5}{\partial x_k} \tag{46}$$

Eq.(45) appears obvious if (1) could be generalized to the case with an inhomogeneous μ_5. In fact, one cannot find any local terms in $\nabla\mu_5$ and $\mathbf{B}$ that can be added to (1) to render the current divergence free. It was pointed out in [19] that a spatially varying μ_5 potential is consistent with the notion of local thermal quilibrium only in the situation where $\nabla\mu_5\perp\mathbf{B}$.

In summary, we noted some problems of the Wigner function formalism because of the UV divergence of the underlying quantum field theory. We find that in the presence of an electromagnetic gauge potential and a non-constant axial vector potential, the electric current extracted from the Wigner function defined by (2) is neither a functional derivative of some effective action with respect to the gauge potential nor conserved. The issue is closely related to the axial anomaly. Therefore, the present form of the Wigner function formulation needs to be revised to be applicable to a general chiral plasma. The subtlety discovered in this work disappears for a constant axial vector potential, leaving the result in [13] intact and the definition appears appropriate.

Technically, the process of the limit $y\to 0$ applied to the axial current extracted from the Wigner function

$$\begin{aligned} J_{5\mu(x)} &= i\int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\mathrm{tr}W(x,p)\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 \\ &= i\lim_{y\to 0}U(x_+,x_-)<\bar\psi(x_+)\gamma_\mu\gamma_5\psi(x_-)> \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

is equivalent to the point-splitting regularization scheme of the axial vector vertex of the triangle diagram in textbooks and this explains why the the standard axial anomaly is generated from the Wigner function (2) in [13]. However, the same limiting procedure for the electric current (4) amounts to a point-splitting regularization of one of the vector vertex of the same triangle diagram and thereby violates the Bose symmetry. For a non-chiral theory or a chiral theory with a constant axial vector potential, this is not a problem and the electric current remains conserved and consistent as can be shown explicitly. In more general situations, an unambiguous limit (4) may be realized with a more cautious definition of the Wigner function that is consistent with the regularization scheme of the underlying field theory. For example, if the underlying field theory is regularized by the Pauli-Villars scheme, there should be additional terms on RHS of (2) with ψ replaced by its corresponding Pauli-Villars regulators, which may play the role of the Bardeen term introduced in [10]. The conservation and consistency of the electric current would be restored then.

Acknowledgments

We are indebted to Hui Liu for her early participation of this project. We thanks K. Fukushima, L. McLerran and Qun Wang for helpful discussions. The interesting comments of K. Landsteiner, M. Chernodub and O. Ruchayskiy are warmly acknowledged. This research is partly supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology of China (MSTC) under the "973" Project No. 2015CB856904(4). Y. Wu is supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central China Normal Universities, and the QLPL under grant No. 201507. D-f. Hou and H-c. Ren are partly supported by NSFC under Grant Nos. 11375070, 11135011 and 11221504.

[1] D. Kharzeev, *Parity Violation in Hot QCD: Why It Can Happen, and How to Look for It*. Phys. Lett., **B633**, 260 (2006) [hep-ph/0406125].

[2] D. Kharzeev, L. D. McLerran and H. Warringa, *The Effects of Topological Charge Change in Heavy Ion Collisions: 'Event by Event P and CP Violation'*, Nucl. Phys. **A803**, 227 (2008) [arXiv:0711.0950]

[3] K. Fukushima, D. Kharzeev and H. Warringa, *The Chiral Magnetic Effect*, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 074033 (2008) [arXiv:0808.3382].

[4] D. Kharzeev, *Parity Violation in Hot QCD: Why It Can Happen, and How to Look for It*. Phys. Lett., **B633**, 260 (2006) [hep-ph/0406125].

[5] STAR Collaboration, *Observation of charge asymmetry dependence of pion elliptic flow and the possible chiral magnetic wave in heavy-ion collisions*. Phys. Rev. **L114**, 252302 (2015) [arXiv:1504.02175].

[6] ALICE Collaboration, *Charge-dependent flow and the search for the Chiral Magnetic Wave in Pb-Pb collisions at* $\sqrt{sNN} = 2.76TeV$. CERN-PH-EP-2015-316 [arXiv:1512.05739].

[7] Qiang Li, Dmitri E. Kharzeev, Cheng Zhang, Yuan Huang, I. Pletikosic, A. V. Fedorov, R. D. Zhong, J. A. Schneeloch, G. D. Gu, T. Valla, *Observation of the chiral magnetic effect in ZrTe5*. [arXiv:1412.6543].

[8] D. Kharzeev, *The Chiral Magnetic Effec and Anomaly-Induced Transport*,to appear in Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics [arXiv:1312.3348].

[9] Defu Hou, Hui Liu and Hai-cang Ren, *Some Field Theoretic Issues Regarding the Chiral Magnetic Effect*, JHEP 1105:046 (2011) [arXiv:1103.2035].

[10] K. Landsteiner, E. Megias and F. Pena-Benitez, *Anomalous Transport from Kubo Formulae*, to appear in Lect. Notes Phys. "Strongly Interacting Matter in Magnetic Fields" (Springer), edited by D. Kharzeev, K. Landsteiner, A. Schmitt and H. -U. Yee [arXiv:1207.5808].

[11] H. U. Yee, *Holographic Chiral Magnetic Conductivity*, JHEP 0911:085 (2009) [arXiv:0908.4189].

[12] I. Latrakis, S. Lin and Y. Yin, *Axial Current Generation by P-odd Domains in QCD Matter*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 252301 (2015) [arXiv:1411.2863].

[13] J. H. Gao, Z. T. Liang, S, Pu, Q. Wang and X, N, Wang, *Chiral Anomaly and Local Polarization Effect from Quantum Kinetic Approach*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109** 232301 (2012).

[14] D. Vasak, M. Gyulassy and H. T. Elze, *Quantum Transport Theory for Abelian Plasmas*, Annals Phys. **173**, 462 (1987).

[15] L. V. Keldysh, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz **47**, 1515 (1964).

[16] P. C. Martin and J. Schwinger, *Theory of Many-Particle Systems.*, Phys. Rev. **115**, 1432 (1959).

[17] Kuang-chao Chou, Zhao-bin Su, Bai-lin Hao and Lu Yu, *Equilibrium and Nonequilibrium Formalisms Made Unified*, Phys. Rep., **118**,1 (1985).

[18] K. Landsteiner, E. Megias and F. Pena-Benitez, *Frequency Dependence of the Chiral Vortical Effect*, Phys. Rev. **D90**, 065026 (2014) [arXiv:1312.1204].

[19] A. Boyarsky, J. Frohlich and O. Ruchayskiy, *Magnetohydrodynamics of Chiral Relativstic Fluids*, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 043004 (2015) [arXiv:1504.04854].

[20] The anomalous divergence of the vector current was noted earlier in the context of Kubo formulae [10, 18].The problem here looks more severe since the limit $y \to 0$ is not well-defined rigorously.